

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 25, 2011 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 2, 4, 7 and 8 are hereby amended. Claims 5 and 12-24 are hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, and 6-11 are currently pending, of these, claims 1 and 9-11 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, 16, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action. *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 4. The rejection of claims 16, 22 and 24 is moot as claims 16, 22 and 24 are canceled herein.

In an effort to advance the application to allowance, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 8. As the Applicant believes these amendments overcome the present rejection, the Applicant requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 2-8.

Claims 12-16 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP 0911710 to Moschuetz (hereinafter “Moschuetz”). *Office Action* at page 4, ¶ 12. The rejection of claims 12-16 and 18-23 is moot as claims 12-16 and 18-23 are canceled herein.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moschuetz. *Office Action* at p. 6, ¶ 19. The rejection of claim 17 is moot as claim 17 is canceled herein.

Claims 2-6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moschuetz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,749,122 to Koenck et al. (hereinafter “Koenck”). *Office Action* at p. 6, ¶ 21. The rejection of claims 5 and 24 is moot as claims 5 and 24 are canceled herein. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 2 is allowable over *Moschuetz* in view of *Koenck* in that claim 2 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “an information displaying step for displaying information on particulars of the pieces of laundry in the information obtained thus; an information request step for requesting the user to determine whether the particulars displayed thus is the same with particulars of laundry having the user introduced thereto actually or not; an information comparing step for comparing user input information with the obtained information to determine whether the user input information matches the obtained information, if the user inputs information on the particulars of the pieces of laundry; and an operation setting step for setting operation of each cycle based on the obtained information if the user input information matches the obtained information and setting operation of each cycle based on the user input information and the obtained information if the user input information does not match the obtained information.”

As admitted by the Office, “*Moschuetz* does not expressly disclose the steps of displaying information on particulars of the pieces of laundry in the information obtained thus, and requesting the user to determine whether the particulars displayed thus is the same with particulars of laundry having the user introduced thereto actually, or not; an information revising step for receiving particulars of the pieces of laundry which are not same from the user in a case particulars of the pieces of laundry responded on the request are not the same with each other; an operation setting step for setting operation of each cycle with reference to the revised particulars, and the information on washing of the pieces of laundry obtained thus.” *Office Action* at p. 7, ¶ 23. Therefore, *Moschuetz* does not teach or suggest, at least, these features of claim 2.

Koenck fails to cure the deficiencies of *Moschuetz*. In contrast, *Koenck* discloses “[i]n case of an error in the data read by the scanner head 77, ... an operator of the device 75 may correct, override or enter data into the device and verify their correctness from the display 79.” *Koenck* at col. 20:18-22. *Koenck* is entirely silent regarding any teaching or suggestion concerning “an information displaying step for displaying information on particulars of the pieces of laundry in the information obtained thus; an information request step for requesting the user to determine whether the particulars displayed thus is the same with particulars of laundry having the user introduced thereto actually or not; an information comparing step for comparing user input information with the obtained information to determine whether the user input

information matches the obtained information, if the user inputs information on the particulars of the pieces of laundry; and an operation setting step for setting operation of each cycle based on the obtained information if the user input information matches the obtained information and setting operation of each cycle based on the user input information and the obtained information if the user input information does not match the obtained information,” as recited in independent claim 2. Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features recited in independent claim 2.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 2. Claims 3, 4 and 6 depend from independent claim 2. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moschuetz* in view of *Koenck* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,388,299 to Lee (hereinafter “*Lee*”). *Office Action* at p. 9, ¶ 30. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of *Moschuetz* and *Koenck* with respect to independent claim 2. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Lee* to purportedly disclose “the total weight of fiber can be automatically determined from summing the weights of individual clothes from information tags.” *Office Action* at p. 10. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 2, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 7 and 8, which depend from claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 8.

CONCLUSION

The application is condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 25, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By /Mark R. Kresloff/
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant